IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC

TUESDAY, THE 23RD OCTOBER 2007 / 1ST KARTHIKA 1929

WP(C).No. 25461 of 2007(F)

PETITIONER:

K.SURENDRAN NAIR,
TC NO.10/1286, USHA MANDIRAM,
MELETHUMMAL, VATTIYOORKAVU, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY ADV. SRI.T.A.UNNIKRISHNAN
SRI.K.SATHEESH KUMAR

RESPONDENTS:
----

1. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE TAHSILDAR,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. JAYAKUMAR,
JAYAKUMAR TEXTILES, VATTIYOORKAVU,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

4. RADHAKRISHNAN,
RAJA TEXTILES, PEROORKADA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY ADV. SRI.M.M.HUSAIN
SRI.S.SHANAVAS (VAVARAMBALAM)
GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. M.R.SABU

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 23/10/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

WP(C) NO: 25461/2007

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS.

EXT.P1. COPY OF THE ROUGH SKETCH OF THE PROPERTY,.

EXT.P2. COPY OF THE COMPLAINT DT.2/2/07 BY THE PETITIONER TO THE R1.

EXT.P3. COPY OF THE REPORT DT. 12/2/2007, FROM THE VILLAGE OFFICER.

EXT.P4. COPY OF THE REPORT DT. 21/07/07 TO THE R1.

EXT.P5. COPY OF THE ORDER DT. 18/2/2007 TO THE PETITIONER.

EXT.P6. COPY OF THE ORDER DT. 9/6/07.

EXT.P7. COPY OF THE ORDER DT. 12/06/2007 TO THE PETITIONER.

EXT.P8. COPY OF THE ORDER DT. 23/7/2007.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS **NIL.**

True copy

tga

ANTONY DOMINIC, J.

= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =
W.P.(C) No. 25461 OF 2007 F
= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =

Dated this the 23rd October, 2007

J U D G M E N T

The complaint of the petitioner is that despite Ext. P6 order of the 1st respondent exercising power under Section 133 Cr.P.C that is not being implemented by the 2nd respondent. It is seen that Ext. P6 is an order issued by the 1st respondent under Section 133, Cr.P.C. By Ext. P7, the parties to the proceedings were also directed to obey the said order. By Ext. P8, the 2nd respondent was also directed to implement the said order and if necessary, with police force. Despite all this it is complained that orders have not been implemented and hence the writ petition.

2. If the orders are not implemented there is absolutely no justification for the same. So long as the orders passed by competent authorities are in force, it is the responsibility of the 2nd respondent to ensure its compliance.

3. In view of this, I dispose of this writ petition directing that the 2nd respondent shall ensure compliance of Ext. P6 by all concerned parties.

ANTONY DOMINIC
JUDGE

jan/-